P.F. 58/95

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1893-94

192 .

(L. R)

File No. 1187/93

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

Index Part B for August 1895

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Kampanna of Shirali, Kundapur Taluk, regarding the Village Site.

Confidential

WD 2233—G P B—20,000—14-6-20

Rd
Indexed

9 (1) 1

Petition No. 3460 dated 25-8-94

Petitioner - Kunjamma
Wife of Raman - residing
at Chittilappilly Karayi
village - Trichur Taluk
Represented by Sri. K.
Sreenivasaya - Advocate

Appeal against the order of the
Commissioner Trichur dated
passed in the O.S. No. 1
of the Second village of Kon-
-thali of Trichur Taluk - Trichur Taluk

The facts of the case are as follows:

On the 25th June 1885 one Kyda
of Chittilappilly Karayi village executed
a petition to the Govt. representing
that they lived in the same village
and held lands in the Second village
of Kunnathali - that the latter village
was formerly subordinate to Cran-
ganore but the village and the
jenmikom - that they were put to
much inconvenience and trouble
as the villages were situated far
from each other - that petitioners

2. Resolved that Kaufmann Lead Mining Company be & he is hereby granted liberty to erect a smelting furnace on their mining property in Lacey Township for smelting the ores raised from the said mines, and that the necessary buildings be erected for the purpose, subject to the approval of the Township Committee.

✓ The Surveyor to the Company applied for permit to erect smelting furnace in the locality mentioned in the application, and produced plan of the proposed furnace, which was explained by the Surveyor to the Committee, and after discussion, on the motion of Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Taylor, it was resolved that the permit be granted subject to the conditions imposed by the Township Committee.

3. That the Secretary be instructed to write to the Secretary of State for Mines asking for information as to the number of mines in the Township, and also as to the number of persons employed in the mines, and the number of fatal accidents during the past year.

29-6-98

No. 417 of 18-8-98

26-7-98

No. 419 of 1-9-98

No. 337 of 13-8-89 — 4. The former statement having been submitted the Dy. Commissioner took steps to get the old village site given with assessment. As regards the ~~former~~ latter statement the Tahsildar examined petitioner Hanumanna, who deposed as follows.

14-7-90.. — 5. "The village of [illegible]halli of this [illegible] has become bechirak — The extent of the village site of this village is a. g. [illegible]. I have consented to give 2 acres out of Survey No. 6 of this village in my holding to the ryots to build houses.

26-7-88 — I have previously deposed that I would not demand any compensation for this. If Govt. would agree and grant the old village site measuring a. g. [illegible] to me I am willing to take it. I would also agree to pay any value the Govt. might fix on 2 ~~cocoanut~~ [illegible] and 1 tamarind trees on the land. I would build a house in the village and live there."

No. 231 of 17-7-90 — 6. The Tahsildar in submitting this and the valuation statement, recommended that it was but just that the old site should be granted to him.

No. 176 of 29-7-90 — 7. On this the Dy. Commr. informed the Tahsildar that the valuation statement ⊕ had been submitted to Govt. for sanction and that the old village site might be given to the petitioner who gave land

⊕ valuation was sanctioned in Govt. Pro. No. 4475-6/162 of 7/6-8-90

praying for the Commissioners to settle
some time for their meeting at the
old village of Fiddington.

Ordered that the Clerk do write 23-7-30
Mr Thompson of Pendock for the Valuation
of Tithes. And Mr Symonds the petitioner 29-9-30
having required the Clerk to state the
old village of Eldersfield, and his
proposition to alter and amend that 20.10.30 & 21-9-30
Order & that he was prepared to
Valuation Statement called for. And
Ordered that the Petitioner do on the
Petitioner complaining of the Clerk 5-2-31
that Mr Nelson had not given to the
Commissioners Notice of the Clerk
refused to permit the Commissioners to
Land from time and prayed that they
might be fixed to some time
Valued and also to permit Commissioners
from time.

Ordered that Mr Richard Symonds
the Valuation Statement called for of the
Settlement of Thompson and others 7-5-31
to be fixed that notice given to Sir
Edward Lechmere Bart. and
Caused an application to be presented
to Commissioners same for Thursday &c.
that after the Cardinal Commissioners
had the parties were present to the Commissioners
and the Commissioners proceeded to the
Commissioners proceeded on the petitioners proceeded 16-8-32

5 for the new village site in which they had built their houses - that part did not acquire land for the village site in the condition of planting them the old village site in return - that there were some cocoanuts and trees and cultivated plants etc. item - that the site should not be planted again and that it should be allowed to remain and planted when necessary for the Assembly -

6 On this the Commissioners ordered the petitioners to be enquired into as to their allegation about taking up the site for payment of the estimated Native amount - The petitioners stated before the Commissioners that he did not take to pay for the amount of the value of the land as he could not afford to do so.

20-11-92

4 On the recommendation the petitioners having declined the said land and in the enquiry the petitioners having alleged that the rights of the authority of the Native Assembly to take land was also by the powers vested in the Native Assembly for the use of the Government

5-12-92

officer who should be present at the 6 7-2-93.
Court for the purpose of the petitioner
for the petitioner as aforesaid
by the Court in the case.

On the 4th December the Petitioner
and Respondent attended the Court that
the petitioner prayed with further
affidavit for the same might be filed
& Order granted & that the Petitioner
should pay the Respondent his costs of
& incident to the application and that
the Petitioner should not be entitled to
proceed with the petition until the
said costs should be paid.

& and no steps taken to enforce order of 4th Sept. 93.

On the 7th July 93 petitioner Kinsman
Respondent attended the Court the second
hearing of the case and that the
matter should be referred for
Early disposal to the Registrar who reported No. 83 of 11-7-93
that the petitioner Kinsman had
had the proceedings in the case filed
in the Registrar's office & that
the Registrar had fixed the case
for hearing on the 14th day of July
instant at 11 o'clock in the forenoon.

On the 14th day of July instant the No. 183 of 14-7-93
Petitioner & Respondent attended that
the petition should be dismissed

Land for the new village which was not
in use was for the purpose
passed to Mr. that he should be
consulted & the Surveyor Land
Mr. Land in Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill
to take for the disposal of the Land
by the Rules made for letting
by inspection & according to
Mr. Hill to report to Land
Valuation -

15 Mr. Hill 7th Sept 93 the Land
agreed that in letting the Plan
Land was to be let by Mr. Hill
to the Surveyor to Mr. Hill
to report to Land Valuation according
to the Land Valuation -

7-7-93

15-9-93

28-9-93

Mr. Hill reported that on 29-9-93.

Mr. Hill reported that on 2nd
Sept 93 the Valuation of the
Land by Mr. Hill was

9 29 of Lec. 20 of the Rev. Rules the land might be ordered to be sold by auction

25-11-93 18 the Dy. Comr. on calling for the proceedings and going through the same order dated Bukkum No. 113 of 14-7-93 was found directing that the old village site should be given to petitioner only if a condition to that effect had been made at the time when the land was given for the new village site - that whether such condition had been effected and that if not how the land was granted

No. 932 of 8-1-94.

No. 1109 of 26-1-94 19 In reply the Assistant referred the Dy. Comr. to Bukkum No. 352 of 19-7-90 directing the grant of the old site to petitioner on payment of the value of the trees on it - that the said order did not mention any condition, nor was it effected - that when the petitioner was informed of the purport of Bukkum No. 113 of 14-7-93 he consented to pay the value of the trees - that consequently the land was on the auction list - of the previous Bukkum put in his possession as the same had not been notified for sale as yet - and that previous orders did not make mention of any condition Except Bukkum No. 113.

20 On this the Dy. Comm. passed the following order:-

No. 6070 of 26-1-94. Bukkum was issued on 14-7-93 that the old site should be given to the man

who gave land for the new village site only if a condition had been made to that effect. But as no such condition had been entered into, the old village site should have been disposed of by sale. It is a mistake to have granted the land on Valuation. Moreover the villagers have presented petitions urging that the land given for the new village site does not solely belong to Kempanna, but it belongs to all. It is alright if Kempanna would effect a compromise with them; if not the old village site should be disposed of by auction. Inform the owners of houses standing on it that they can remove the old materials thereof.

60

6-2-94

Whereupon a notice was issued to petitioner directing him to effect a compromise with the villagers and to submit the Karjinama within a fortnight.

24-2-94

The petitioner in reply represents to the Amildar that [illegible] Excepting the complaint of Venkatarayappa son of Ramappa, who neither owned any land nor built a house in the village, made through his no ryots ever objected to the old site being granted to him. That he had nothing to compromise with them. That the Shekdar in collusion with the Shanbogue had without disclosing the reference made to him about the land returned the records with him for about a year and prays that the complaint

in 1890

note

⊕ The Shekdar was ordered to fill the trees valued on 23-2-94 he submitted the Statement of Valuation on

for the old village site under dispute 8
(Survey No. 21). In this the Amildar
directed to issue an endorsement to him
to the effect that it could not be granted 4-9-93
to him as the same had previously
been sanctioned due from to petitioner
Kempanna - Venkataramappa
on learning that the site was put in
possession of petitioner Kempanna
having submitted a [illegible] this
darkhast he was granted a detailed
endorsement to the effect that the site No. 1270 of 10-11-93
could not be granted to him as the
same was in accordance with the
previous order from the district already
put in possession of Kempanna on
payment of the value of the trees in con-
-sideration of his having parted with
2 acres of land out of his holding to the
Ryots of the village for house building
purposes.

Thereupon the said Venkataramappa
preferred an appeal to the Dy. Commr.
urging that the land had not yet been
put in possession of Kempanna on
the date of his darkhast ⊕ - that it was
against the rules that Kempanna was
put in possession of the land as he had
declined to pay the [illegible] and
thereby lost his right - that the trees should
have been revalued according to the rate then prevailing
and the land granted to him and that there
were buildings built of stones worth about 50 rupees
on the land and prayed that under clause

⊕ Note
Date of darkhast - 3-9-93
Date on which land
was put in possession
of ~~darkhastdar~~ petr. - 26/27-9-93

of the Land Registrar rejecting the application.

No. 2093 of 10-3-94

23. The Land Registrar granted the petitioner an adjournment to file further affidavit but the petitioner failed to file any affidavit within the period allowed. The case was then fixed for hearing on 30/4/94 when the petitioner appeared in person and the case was heard.

24. The land was duly advertised in the said gazette. Gazette was produced as P. Exh. 3 which the petitioner paid the fees amounting to Kshs. 1,000/= vide receipt No. 4-6-94. The petitioner did not file any objection to the said gazette.

23-3-94

25. The petitioner testified in support of his petition and stated that he was the registered owner of the suit land measuring 0.5 hectares. He stated that he had been in occupation of the land since 1980 and that he had been cultivating the land. He stated that he had been paying land rates in respect of the land and that he had been issued with receipts in respect of the land. He stated that he had

belong to the patel of the village public - (2
that if they had right over they should
have deprived the petitioner of its possession
through a civil court - that if previous
orders had been taken into consideration
the order for its sale would not have
been issued - and that this old village
site measuring ?-? was given to him
on his giving 2 acres of land for the
new village site and also in payment
of the estimated value of this - and
praying that the order of sale might
be set aside and the sale might be
stayed pending disposal of his petition
On this the Dy. Comr. on perusal
of the records granted the following endorse- No. 583 of 2-5-94.
-ment to petitioner -

It is clear from the Tahsildar's report
No. 1109 of 21-1-94 that the patta of
the land you gave for the new village
site was in your name only nominally,
that the land having belonged to villagers
they used to pay to govt. the Kandayam
due in their respective portions, and that
the land for the new village site was not
acquired from you on the understanding
that the old village site would be given to
you in return. Under the circumstances
the old village site cannot be granted
to you without sale or receiving its value
from you - If you choose you can

in Office since the year 1878. Owing to his old age, his son has been appointed to act for him. The question whether the petitioner is the legal heir of the deceased Hanmayya and whether she is entitled to succeed to the Office of Potail has been reserved for decision till the death of the present occupant of the Office or till he should forfeit his right to that Office by misconduct or otherwise.

4. The file of memorandum Correspondence ending with Hanmayya Deputy Amildar's report No: 65 of 18th July last is also herewith submitted for reference. The petition received with the memorandum reply is returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
Illegible
Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

the same to the Deputy Commissioner
in his nos: 231 & 255 of 18 & 23rd July 1890.

5. The Deputy Commissioner issued
the order no: 322 of 23rd July 1890, to
the Amildar, that the old village
site may be granted to the petitioner.

6. When the Deputy Commissioner
referred the matter to the Govt.
it was approved of in the order no: 4495-6/162 of 5th August 1890.

7. The Amildar quoting all the
above orders ordered him to take charge
of the old village site on 30th Sept. 1890
& granted him Sagvini exit after
which he has been enjoying the same
after spending about 50 or 60 Rs on it.

8. Immediately the patta was prepared
in his name & he has paid two years
assessment Rs 11-12-9 on the same.
He paid the Inalki amount Rs 19-8-0
on 5th September 1892.

9. In the meanwhile one Venkatarayappa
with some mischievous ryots addressed
a petition to the Deputy Commissioner
on 14th December 1892 that the said
ryots possess some claims to the number
16. that the old village site may not be
given to the petitioners in lieu of the
new site taken, & that the same may
be granted to them. This petition contained
everything that was false.

10. On the foregoing endorsements were
granted to the said petitioners to the effect
that their requests cannot be granted
as the said site was already in the
possession of the petitioners, but when they

Continued

13

Cid for it in Madras and keep it
Plaintiff has also petitioned
has applied enjoining that the Defts
from selling the premises
over into Commissioners hands
the Defts have appealed against and
praying that the penal bill
stayed in the case the Sale may
be annulled and the land assigned
to them.

M.C.

If the Cause had not
been sold, I would have
given it to Petitioner, but
I do not see how to
cancel the sale
Petitioner has no legal
claim to the land, as
he did not give up his Patta
land on the condition of
his getting the D sale
in exchange. Under
my allegn therefore that
there is a case for and
interference, I would
issue the following endorsement

"Petitioner's claim is unfounded
~~Petitioner has no right~~
~~to~~ as he did not part
with his Patta land on the endorsement

If the Defts the land be not
sold, grant stay as
no reason to interfere
with the contract entered
by the Defts

M.C.
12/11/85

This seems a hard
case. The complaint
that plaintiff in 1875
should [illegible] at 2 am
[illegible] Compromise
[illegible] in order to
[illegible] for 16 [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] in spite of
[illegible] the case is annulled
[illegible]

Consent to order
Complainant
Petitioner
Respondent

7/11/85

16

continued to [illegible] false petitions
[illegible] the following
Qu? ordered
unjust order to the effect that the
petitioner had no promise made to him that the old
site would be given for the 2 acres of land
taken for the new site, that the petitioner
should settle the affair with the [illegible]
or that the land should be sold in a
public sale.

12. The Amildar intimated the same
to him on 6th February 1894.

13. He immediately appealed to the
Deputy Commissioner & prayed
for the stay of the sale of the said
site, but notwithstanding it was
sold on 15th April which was brought
by the said Venkatasayappa (Respt)

14. The Deputy Commissioner
without going into the case thoroughly
passed the order, viz: 3509 2nd May
1894, that the sale was properly held

15. Prays that the whole proceedings may
be perused, that the sale may
be cancelled & that his Petition may
be confirmed.

Prays also that the Deputy Commissioner
may be ordered not to confirm the sale
& not to dispossess him (Petr) of the site,
pending the disposal of this appeal &c.

Petr
[illegible]

18

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 17/18 [illegible] 231 [illegible]

[illegible] 23 [illegible]

25-5- [illegible]

5- [illegible] 23 [illegible] 352 [illegible]

6- [illegible] 5/6 [illegible] 4495-6/162 [illegible]

7- [illegible] 30 [illegible] 90 [illegible]

122 [illegible]

26 [illegible]

[illegible] 50-60 [illegible]

8-

(4)




MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO.
DATE 4-6-94

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು — ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು — ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು — ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಘೋಷಿಸಬೇಕು

14 — ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಸೂಚಿ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ — ಕಾರ್ಯಸೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ — ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು

15 — ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಸೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಸಭೆಯ ಕೋರಂ ಇರಬೇಕು — ಕೋರಂ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಗುವುದು — ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾದ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರಂ ಇರಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರಲಿ ಸಭೆಯು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ

16 — ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು — ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು — ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಅನುಮತಿ ನೀಡಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು

17 — ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು — ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪರಸ್ಪರರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು

18 — ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು — ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪರಸ್ಪರರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು

19 — ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು — ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪರಸ್ಪರರನ್ನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು

[illegible]

[illegible]

28/5/94

I [illegible]

2 [illegible]

1- [illegible]

2- [illegible]

3- 26-9-93 [illegible]

4- [illegible]



22

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

ಸನ್ 1893 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ——— ನಂಬರ್

ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು. ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ಮೇಸ್ಟರ್- ಅಡೊವ್ಕೇಟ್ - ಜುಲ್, ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರವರಿಗೆ.

——— ಬರೆಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿವಗೈರ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಸೈಸೆಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ್ದ್ದಾಗ್ಯು, ಮತ್ತು ನನಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಪಿಕವಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಂಡ್ಲ್ಕಾಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗಮುಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀದಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ನಮಗಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದ್ದನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು ನೇ
ಸನ್ 1893 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸಹಿ.

26-5-94

ಸಹಿ.

-24-5-94-

ಈ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತುಲಸೀಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ, ಖಿ - ರಾತೆಯಾಜಾರ್ಯರಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯಾದ ಮುದ್ರಾಕ್ಷರಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು.

Pet 252

20-8-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 47

dated 28th May 1894 received at the Dewan's Office from Kempanna of Chikkanayakanahalli Tumkur Taluk, appealing against the Dy. Commissioner's order No. 550 dated 22 May 1894 rejecting the plaint of the petitioner

is forwarded, together with its 5 enclosures, to the Dy. Commr. Tumkur District for transmission of the entire proceedings connected with the case & especially the deposition alleged to have been recorded by Deputy Tahsildar on 7th July 1893.

2. The petitioner has to furnish enclosures should be re-

— Irvine

L.R. 118-93-2

Order granted as per petitioner.

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
8 August 1894
21.

Counsel ordered

S.V.R.

13/8

M.G.C.P., Bangalore.—3-8-94.—1,000.

(3) (2)

(General Serial No. 30.)

6938.

94 1894.95 Ref: 310

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkúr District

L.R. 118-93-3

To Govt

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Govt~~
of Mysore.

L.R. 118-93-3

Dated } 24th November
Despatched } —— do ——
Received } 1894.

Enclosures No. 2 files

General No. 462.
No.

This Official Memorandum No. Ref Assistant 252
8th August 1894.

Submitting the entire record connected with the case of the Ryot of the dispossessed village of Nocanahally in the Tiptúr taluk.

29/11/94

Papers to be perused
29/11/94 attached to 6/12/94 RK

No. 462
Encls: 2 files

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Tirunelveli District.
Dated 2nd November
1894

To
The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith the Official Memorandum No. Pet 252 dated the 5th August 1894, and have the honour to submit herewith the entire record connected with the case of the disputed village of Varahalli in the Tiruchi taluk. The disposition of the appellant referred to in the Memorandum under reply, is also in the file. It dated the 14th July 1890 but not the 14th July 1890. —

2. The enclosures of the Official Memorandum under reply are herewith returned. —

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner.

Draft order appeal

24 P(5)

Proceedings of the Govt of Fiji

L.R. 118-93-4

Read

(1) Petition No 3 of 25th May 94 from Ramdeen by Kanhaiya of Chikkanaraji in the Innisfail District, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Innisfail, cancelling the grant to him of the village site of Beckinak Mandalli, and directing the same to be sold by public auction.

(2) Records received with the Innisfail Deputy Commr's letter No 402 dated 27th November 1894.

Order thereon. No 312 P.F. 5-95 867-95

The proceedings state that some of the Ryots of Chikkanaraji holding lands in the Beckinak village

village of Mazarelli wished to
remove themselves into the
Bechiwal village, building
their houses on a different site
from the old village site which
had been abandoned; that
the Petitioner, who holds S.No. 6
in the Bechiwal village, agreed
to part with 2 acres of it, against
compensation, for the location
of the new village, and to take
the old village site measuring
1 acre 1 gunta in exchange;
that after some correspondence
the Amildar, relying upon an
order issued by the Deputy
Commissioner on 29th July 1890,
granted the site to Petitioner
on 28th Sept 93, after removing
from him the value of the trees
thereon, Rs 19-8-0; and that the
Petitioner was accordingly
put in possession of the site
on 29th September 93. On the
complaint preferred by the Respondent

Venkatāchāryappa on 2nd Nov. 95

the Deputy Commr decided

that there was no condition

that the site should be granted

to Petitioner in lieu of the 2

acres out of Rs 15 given by him,

and directed that the site

should be sold by auction,

unless the Petitioner effected

a compromise with Venkatāchāryappa

and other villagers. Petitioner

not having succeeded in

effecting a compromise, the

site was sold on 16th April 94

and was purchased by Venkatā-

chāryappa for Rs 85. The Petitioner

has appealed against the sale.

2. The Respondent Venkatā-

chāryappa did not appear,

though notice of hearing

was served on him on the 16th

June 1895.

3. [illegible]

[illegible], Government are

are of opinion that the grant of the old village site to the Petitioner should be confirmed, and the sale to Venkatasubbiah cancelled. The price of the Revenue from Petitioner will be credited to Government and the purchase money paid by Venkatasubbiah refunded to him.

Revenue Board's

To

The Deputy Commr.
Tumkur District

Proceedings

(4)

30

2/2.15

(General Serial No. 29.)

3539

OFFICE OF THE
3539
24 III 90
DEWAN OF M.

1890.

From The Private Secretary
Camp Kadur

51

To The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

L.R. 116-93-6

accounts
24/7/90

Read Draft filed
29/7 BB
2/8

Dated 22 July 1890

Despatched

Received 4/8/90

Enclosures No.

General No. √

No. 200

Sir, I am directed to forward herewith a statement showing the Fasli Cists proposed to be assigned in the Village of Kodanadi in the Taluq of Kadur during the Fasli and to request that the assignment may be duly sanctioned and the necessary credit for the assessment entered in the Books of the accounts.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
Private Secretary
Camp Kadur

Kkk

31
28-7-90

in Settled Districts: 32

Particulars of grant				Whether old village site is to be reserved or new site being granted or whether the new grant is only to extend the village site	For Sanction		
Survey No.	Extent of land	Allotment	Class of tenure — whether grant to private individuals or communal or part in one part in the other alienated.		Authority sanctioning alienation.	No. and date of order.	Remarks.
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
10	A. R. P. 2 — —	R. P. 1 — 3	For dwelling purposes. To be alienated to Omaya Labumadar and others. 10 conveniences is for the period, the owners of the land having agreed to give up the area of land occupied by them.	Old village site has been agreed and will be given up for cultivation. This grant is to build a new village, the old village having become deserted and the title forfeited.			Certificate recommended that the land may be alienated and the proclamation recommended thereon ordered to be struck off the accounts.

Deputy Commissioner.

Taihape
22nd July 1898.

Statement showing details regarding the Khetwar patrika

Gimkhir	1	District.
Gimkhir	2	Taluk
Gatir	3	Nagani
Hosahalli	4	Village Estate or Ownership
16	5	Survey No:
2. 3. 13 - 2	6	Area in Acres.
R. A. 8 - [illegible]	7	Assessment.
Occupied.	8	Occupied or waste as per Village form I Khetwar patrika.

As per Village Records.

L. R. 108-937

4495-6

Draft

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

READ—

Letter No. 200 dated the 22nd July 1890

from the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District.

4495-6

ORDER THEREON No. 162 dated 5-8-1890

Part B Survey No. 16 Sanad Assessment A-8-2-0 A 1-0-0

The alienation recommended by the Deputy Commissioner,

assessed/unassessed

of the marginally noted land in favor of Pangadarya and others of Hosahalli village Gubbi Tumkur taluk Tumkur District for building purposes

~~building purposes~~

including the Village

——— and the remission of the proportionate assessment thereon are sanctioned

2. The Deputy Commr should have stated whether assessed or unoccupied land is now available for building purposes in the Village

~~Chief Secretary.~~

for Chief Secty

To—The Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District.

The Superintendent Revenue Survey with copy of Alienation Statement.